

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER: _____**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,277	10/17/2000	Syne Mitchell	MICR0194	4966

27792 7590 08/27/2004

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
LAW OFFICES OF RONALD M. ANDERSON
600 108TH AVENUE N.E., SUITE 507
BELLEVUE, WA 98004

EXAMINER

LAZARO, DAVID R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/691,277

Applicant(s)

MITCHELL ET AL.

Examiner

David Lazaro

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the RCE filed 07/06/2004.
2. Claims 1, 12, 18, 22, 24 and 25 were amended.
3. Claims 1-16 and 18-25 are pending in this Office Action.
4. The 35 U.S.C. §112 First paragraph rejection of Claims 1, 11, 12, 18, 22, 24, and 25 is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
6. Claims 1-9, 11 and 18-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,300,947 by Kanevsky.
7. With respect to Claim 1, Kanevsky teaches a method for selectively displaying an additional content in a Web page based on an available display area (Col. 9 lines 39-41), comprising the steps of: (a) automatically detecting dimensions of the available display area (Col. 6 lines 4-28); (b) automatically determining whether the additional content and a primary content can both be fully displayed in a single web page in the available display area without requiring scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 9 lines 35-41 and Col. 10 lines 46-51) and without requiring a modification of either the primary or the additional content that results in either the primary or the additional content being perceived in less than its entirety on the single web page (Col. 10 lines 46-51), said additional content not being necessarily related to the primary content (Col. 9 lines 39-

41); and if so, (c) displaying the additional content and the primary content (Col. 9 lines 39-41 and Col. 10 lines 46-51); else (d) displaying only the primary content (Col. 8 lines 29-34).

8. With respect to Claim 2, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein the available display area comprises an area defined by a browser window (Col. 1 lines 36-47) produced by a browser program (Col. 4 lines 64-65); and wherein the step of detecting the dimensions of the available display area includes the steps of: (a) detecting properties of the browser program that produced the browser window (Col. 5 lines 5-19 and line 63 to Col. 6 lines 3); (b) providing instructions compatible with the detected properties of the browser program (Col. 5 lines 23-29); and (c) executing the instructions to automatically detect the dimensions of the browser window (Col. 2 lines 12-19 and Col. 6 lines 20-27).

9. With respect to Claim 3, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 2 and further teaches wherein the step of automatically determining occurs when the browser window is initially displayed by the browser program (Col. 7 lines 25-47 and Col. 16 lines 47-56).

10. With respect to Claim 4, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 2 and further teaches wherein the step of automatically determining comprises the step of storing a pointer to a previously defined event handler used by the browser program (Col. 17 lines 50-59 and Col. 18 lines 1-14)).

11. With respect to Claim 5, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 4 and further teaches wherein the previously defined event handler responds to at least one of

Art Unit: 2155

initially displaying content in the browser window, and resizing the browser window (Col. 17 lines 50-59 and Col. 18 lines 1-14).

12. With respect to Claim 6, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 5 and further teaches wherein the step of displaying only the primary content comprises the step of executing the previously defined event handler (Col. 17 lines 33-39).

13. With respect to Claim 7, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein the step of automatically determining comprises the step of automatically determining if at least one dimension of the available display area is sufficient to display the additional content (Col. 10 lines 39-41 and Col. 11 lines 49-51).

14. With respect to Claim 8, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 5 and further teaches further comprising the step of responding to a change in the available display area by again automatically determining whether the additional content and the primary content can both be fully displayed in the available display area without requiring scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 17 lines 39-44 and lines 50-59 and Col. 11 line 49-51).

15. With respect to Claim 9, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein the step of automatically determining comprises the step of iteratively automatically determining whether a further additional content can be fully displayed with the primary content and a previous additional content in the available display area without requiring scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 10 lines 39-41, Col. 11 lines 49-51 and lines 14-24).

16. Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in Claim 1. Note also in Kanevsky (Col. 5 lines 23-29).

17. With respect to Claim 18, Kanevsky teaches a method for providing content to a browser program for display in a browser window without requiring scrolling in more than one direction to fully display the additional content, comprising the steps of: (a) automatically detecting properties that identify the browser program (Col. 2 lines 12-19 and Col. 5 lines 5-19); (b) automatically determining instructions that are compatible with the browser program (Col. 5 lines 23-29), to display at least a portion of the additional content without scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 7 lines 25-28) and without requiring a modification of the additional content that results in said at least the portion of the additional content being perceived in less than its entirety on the single web page (Col. 10 lines 46-51), based on an available display area in the browser window (Col. 9 lines 39-41); and (c) communicating the instructions to the browser program (Col. 2 lines 13-16), said instructions causing the additional content to be fully displayed only if possible to do so without requiring scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 7 lines 25-28) and without requiring a modification of the additional content that results in said at least the portion of the additional content being perceived in less than its entirety on the single web page (Col. 10 lines 46-51).

18. With respect to Claim 19, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 18 and further teaches wherein the step of automatically detecting comprises the step of parsing a request from the browser program for content to be displayed by the browser

program, to determine information that identifies the browser program (Col. 6 lines 20-29 and lines 45-51).

19. With respect to Claim 20, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 18 and further teaches wherein the step of automatically determining comprises the steps of: (a) determining a type of the browser program being used from the set of properties; and (Col. 5 lines 5-19) (b) selecting specific instructions written to be implemented by the type of the browser program being used (Col. 2 lines 12-19).

20. With respect to Claim 21, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 18, wherein the step of communicating comprises the steps of: (a) obtaining the instructions that are compatible with the browser program (Col. 2 lines 12-19); (b) upon receiving a request for a content from the browser program, providing a response that includes at least a portion of the content requested (Col. 8 line 35-44) and the instructions (Col. 2 lines 12-19); and (c) conveying the response to the browser program (Col. 2 lines 12-19 and Col. 8 lines 35-44).

21. With respect to Claim 22, Kanevsky teaches a system for displaying a Web page and selectively displaying an additional content, based on an available display area (Col. 9 lines 39-41), comprising: (a) a memory adapted to store data and machine instructions (Col. 5 lines 23-29); (b) a processor coupled to the memory, said processor controlling storage of data in the memory and executing the machine instructions to implement a plurality of functions (Col. 5 lines 23-29); (c) a persistent storage device, coupled to the processor and the memory, on which are stored machine instructions (Col. 5 lines 23-29), which when executed by the processor, cause it to selectively fully

display a primary content of a Web page and the additional content without requiring scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 7 lines 25-28 and Col. 9 lines 39-41) and without requiring a modification of either the primary or the additional content that results in either the primary or the additional content being perceived in less than its entirety on the single web page (Col. 10 lines 46-51), said additional content not being necessarily related to the primary content (Col. 9 lines 39-41); and (d) a display on which said primary content and said additional content are rendered in accord with the machine instructions, said display being controlled by the processor, said plurality of functions implemented by the processor executing the machine instructions (Col. 5 lines 5-19 and line 63 to Col. 6 line 3) including: (i) detecting dimensions of the available display area (Col. 6 lines 4-6 and 20-27); (ii) selectively displaying both the primary content and the additional content, if the primary content and the additional content are fully displayable without scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 9 lines 39-41 and Col. 10 lines 49-51); and if not, (iii) displaying only the primary content (Col. 8 lines 29-44).

22. With respect to Claim 23, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 22 and further teaches wherein the machine instructions that cause the processor to selectively display the additional content are downloaded to the memory over a computer network (Col. 2 lines 12-19).

23. With respect to Claim 24, Kanevsky teaches a system for displaying a Web page and selectively displaying an additional content, based on an available display area (Col. 9 lines 39-41), comprising: (a) a remote computer operatively connected to a communication network, said remote computer including a processor, and a memory in

which machine instructions are stored that when executed by the processor while the remote computer is coupled in communication with a client device, carry out a plurality of functions (Col. 5 lines 20-56), including: (i) identifying a client browser program running on the client device (Col. 2 lines 12-19 and Col. 5 lines 5-19); (ii) determining machine instructions that are compatible with the client browser program (Col. 5 lines 23-29), for causing the client browser program to fully display at least a selected portion of the additional content without scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 7 lines 25-28) and without requiring a modification of the additional content that results in said at least the selected portion of the additional content being perceived in less than its entirety on the single web page (Col. 10 lines 46-51), based on the available display area on the client device (Col. 9 lines 39-41 and Col. 10 lines 49-51) ; and (iii) communicating the machine instructions to the client browser program (Col. 2 lines 12-17); and (b) a client device operatively connected in communication with the remote computer over said communication network, the client device including a display, a processor, and a memory in which instructions are stored, said instructions, when executed by the processor in the client device, carrying out a plurality of functions, including (Col. 5 line 5 to Col. 6 line 3): (i) communicating said client browser properties to said remote computer when requesting a primary, content of a Web page from said remote computer (Col. 2 lines 12-17 and Col. 6 lines 20-28); (ii) receiving said primary content and said machine instructions from said remote computer (Col. 2 lines 12-19); (iii) detecting dimensions of an available display area on the client device (Col. 6 lines 20-28); (iv) determining whether the additional content and the primary content can both be

fully displayed in the available display area without requiring scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 8 lines 26-44, Col. 9 lines 39-41 and Col. 11 lines 14-24) and without requiring a modification of the additional content that results in said at least the portion of the additional content being perceived in less than its entirety on the single web page (Col. 10 lines 46-51); and if so (v) displaying at least the selected portion of the additional content and the primary content on the display of the client device (Col. 9 lines 39-41, Col. 10 lines 49-51 and Col. 11 lines 14-24); else (vi) displaying only the primary content on the display of the client device (Col. 8 lines 26-44).

24. With respect to Claim 25, Kanevsky teaches a computer-readable medium having a computer-executable component for selectively displaying an additional content in a Web page based on an available display area (Col. 9 lines 39-41), wherein said component is integral with a browser program in which the Web page is displayed (Col. 2 lines 12-19), said computer-executable component causing a plurality of functions to be carried out when executed by a computer, including: (a) automatically determining whether an additional content and a primary content can both be fully displayed in a single web page in the available display area without requiring scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 9 lines 35-41 and Col. 10 lines 46-51) and without requiring a modification of either the primary or the additional content that results in either the primary or the additional content being perceived in less than its entirety on the single web page (Col. 10 lines 46-51), said additional content not being necessarily related to the primary content (Col. 9 lines 39-41); and if so, (c) displaying the additional

content and the primary content (Col. 9 lines 39-41 and Col. 10 lines 46-51); else (d) displaying only the primary content (Col. 8 lines 29-34).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

25. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

26. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of U.S. Patent 6,098,096 by Tsirigotis et al. (Tsirigotis). Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 further teaches display of additional content (Col. 9 lines 39-41 and Col. 10 lines 49-51). Kanevsky does not explicitly disclose determining if the additional content to be displayed was previously downloaded and retrieving the content if needed. However, it is well known in the art that it can be determined if content has been previously downloaded and retrieving the content if it was not as shown by Tsirigotis (Col. 5 line 58 – Col. 6 line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Kanevsky and modify it as indicated by Tsirigotis such that wherein the step of displaying the additional content and the primary content comprises the steps of: (a) determining whether the additional content was previously downloaded from a remote storage; and if not, (b) retrieving the additional content from the remote storage and displaying both the primary content and the additional content; else (c) displaying both the primary content and the additional content that was previously downloaded from the

remote storage. One would be motivated to have this as it saves time that would have otherwise been used to retrieve the content (Col. 2 lines 24-36).

27. Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of U.S. Patent 6,593,943 by MacPhail.

28. With respect to Claim 12, Kanevsky teaches a method for controlling display of a Web page on a device (Col. 2 lines 12-19), comprising the steps of: (a) automatically determining an available display area for displaying a content of the Web page on the device (Col. 6 lines 4-28); (b) automatically determining a combination of different portions of the content that can be fully displayed in a single web page in the available display area without requiring scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 8 lines 26-44 and Col. 9 lines 35-41 and Col. 11 lines 1-24) and without requiring a modification of the content that results in the content being perceived in less than its entirety on the single web page (Col. 11 lines 1-24) (c) displaying only the portion of the content that can be fully displayed in the available display area without scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 7 lines 25-28 and Col. 11 lines 14-24) and without requiring a modification of the content that results in the content being perceived in less than its entirety (Col. 11 lines 1-24). Kanevsky does not explicitly disclose the step of determining being one of automatically converting a portion of the content into a moving image or automatically subdividing a portion of the content into subportions that are displayed sequentially within the available display area. MacPhail teaches that information from a web page can be divided such that portions are displayed sequentially within the available display

area (Col. 2 lines 3-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Kanevsky and modify it as indicated by MacPhail such that said step of automatically determining the combination of different portions of the content comprises at least one of the steps of: (i) automatically converting a portion of the content into a moving image within the available display area; and (ii) automatically subdividing a portion of the content into subportions that are displayed sequentially within the available display area. One would be motivated to have this as it is desirable to efficiently deliver information to devices having displays of arbitrary size (Col.3 lines 14-17 of MacPhail).

29. With respect to Claim 13, Kanevsky in view of MacPhail teaches all the limitations of Claim 12 and further teaches the step of dividing the Web page into discrete content modules that are selectively displayable (Col. 11 lines 14-24).

30. With respect to Claim 14, Kanevsky in view of MacPhail teaches all the limitations of Claim 12 and further teaches wherein the step of determining the portion of the content that can be fully displayed in the available display area without requiring scrolling in more than one direction comprises the step of prioritizing different portions of the content based on an order of importance, said different portions of the content corresponding to specific areas of the Web page that are selectively displayed as a function of the available display area (Col. 11 lines 14-24).

31. With respect to Claim 15, Kanevsky in view of MacPhail teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches wherein the step of prioritizing comprises the

step of ranking the different portions of the content according to their importance in conveying information on the Web page (Col. 11 lines 14-24 and 42-63).

32. With respect to Claim 16, Kanevsky in view of MacPhail teaches all the limitations of Claim 12 and further teaches wherein the step of automatically determining the portion of the content that can be fully displayed in the available display area without requiring scrolling in more than one direction, comprises the steps of: (a) detecting a respective share of the available display area required by each portion of the content (Col. 8 lines 49-53); and (b) automatically determining a combination of different portions of the content that are displayable in the display area, based upon the respective share of the display area required by each different portion of the content (Col. 8 lines 44-53 and Col. 9 lines 35-41).

Response to Arguments

33. Applicant's arguments filed 07/06/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

34. Applicants argue - *"Both of these statements (from Kanevsky) seem to indicate that additional content may be displayed only if a certain condition is met - namely, if there is space available beyond that display area needed to display the primary content. But Kanevsky's additional content display is in the form of objects and links added to the web page. So, additional content is displayed, but the additional content is not fully displayed on the Web page, since activating a link to display the additional content opens a different web page. As described above, "fully displayed" means displayed*

completely. An object or link added to the web page does not provide the user with a full display of the additional content."

a. Indeed Kanevsky will display additional content when there is space available beyond the display area needed to display the primary content. This condition may come about from web pages designed for smaller resolutions being displayed on screens set at a larger resolution (Col. 1 lines 13-36). This condition is also noted by the Applicants' specification (See pages 10-11, starting with last paragraph on page 10). Kanevsky describes adding objects and links in the given statements, with objects being visual objects of a web page such as icons, text and graphic images (Col. 8 lines 32-33 and Col. 10 lines 56-59). The examiner interprets these added objects as directly being the "additional content". The examiner understands the argument made by the Applicants in making a distinction between displaying fully an additional content as opposed to a reference to that additional content or only a "partial display" of that content. However, the examiner does not interpret the claim language to read as such or that the "objects" of Kanevsky have to be activated to link to further content (see the following argument in paragraph b. for more explanation). The claim language does not explicitly define the form the "additional content" must take and therefore can be interpreted broadly such that "objects and links" can be considered "additional content". This interpretation is further supported by several areas of the Applicants' specification. On page 10, last paragraph, the specification states contents may comprise "text, video, or graphics...or other

contents of the various types typically contained in web pages.” On page 20, last paragraph, the specification states content may be limited to “small icons or only a few lines of text”. On Page 21, second paragraph, the specification states a “content item may comprise a URL hyper link to a Web page with additional detail about the content item”. Based on these citations, content can be icons, text, graphics, or links. As stated before, Kanevsky also adds content that can be icons, text, graphics or links. When such additional content is added, it is “fully displayed” as there are no modifications required to either primary or additional content under the condition described above. Specifically, in the embodiment of Kanevsky’s invention where the display size is greater than the display size needed for displaying web pages, additional content (such as those described above) may be added to the web pages (Col. 10 lines 45-51). Modifications are not required nor are any stated by Kanevsky for this specific condition since the display size is greater than the display size needed, and therefore, the primary and additional content is perceived in its entirety.

35. Applicants argue - *“Thus, it is apparent from the citations to column 10 and column 9 above, that if extra space is available, the additional content is added in the form of objects and links. So additional content is not merely added to be displayed on the same web page in Kanevsky, and Kanevsky therefore differs from applicants’ claimed invention, because applicants’ claims recite an invention that avoids the use of objects and links to reference additional content and instead, fully displays any*

Art Unit: 2155

additional content...Kanevsky also does not teaches or suggest that additional content and primary content must be fully displayed in a single web page...Content in the form of objects (for example, if an icon) and links are not displayed unless the user clicks on each object and link and opens one or more additional web pages to view the added content."

b. As stated above in the previous argument, the claim language does not explicitly define the form the "additional content" must take and therefore can be interpreted broadly such that "objects and links" can be considered "additional content". A link, while being a reference to other content, can itself alone, be considered additional content (or a portion of content). As noted before, Applicants' specification (Page 21, second paragraph) also supports this interpretation, which seems to contradict the argument the Applicants are making. Furthermore, in Kanevsky, if a single graphic or a small amount of text is inserted that does not link to any other content, then this additional content would not be a reference to additional content. It would be a full representation of additional content (or a portion of content) in its entirety and in a single web page with the primary content. Kanevsky does not state that the added objects (icons, text, graphics, etc) have to be a reference to additional content and that an object links to other content such that additional web pages have to be opened. Kanevsky even states it would be beneficial for those with large displays to be able to see the contents of multiple links simultaneous in a single web page being displayed (Col. 1 lines 31-34).

36. Applicants argue - *"Kanevsky does not teach that additional content and primary content must be fully displayed in a webpage without requiring scrolling in more than one direction...since the user may have to scroll in two directions in order to view the content in Kanevsky, the reference teaches away from viewing the additional and primary content without having to scroll in more than one direction."*

c. The scrolling mentioned by Kanevsky only occurs when the picture is "partly displayed" (Col. 16 lines 26-29), such as a condition where the display size is not larger than the webpage as originally designed. However, this is not the condition as to which the examiner is rejecting the claims. The embodiment of which the examiner has interpreted to read on the applicants' claims is the condition where the display size is larger than the display size needed for displaying the web page (Col. 10 lines 46-51). As such, a picture on this page, even if its size is unknown, would still fit the display size since the web page as a whole would fit in the display size with space left over for additional content. As such, a picture would not be "partly displayed" and therefore scrolling would not occur. Furthermore, Kanevsky's method does not modify either content in situations where additional content can be displayed with primary content (Col. 10 lines 46-51) and the page is fully displayed without scrolling in any direction (Col. 7 lines 25-33) which qualifies as "without having to scroll in more than one direction".

37. Applicants argue - *"Kanevsky's method displays additional content in a browser program only by substantially modifying the content (Kanevsky, column 9, lines 35-39)."*

d. The cited section of Kanevsky describes what happens when "the display size is smaller than the display size used for the web pages". This is not the embodiment the examiner refers to in the rejections. The embodiment the examiner refers to is stated in column 9 lines 39-41, where "the user's display size is larger than the web page design intended".

38. Applicants argue - *"With regard to independent claim 22, applicants method clearly implements functions different than those of Kanevsky's method, both in regard to the modification of content require by Kanevsky to fully display the additional and primary content, and in regard to the source of the additional content."*

e. The examiner notes again that modifications are not required by Kanevsky to fully display the additional and primary content. As for the source of the additional content, the claims state "not being necessarily related to the primary content". In general, Kanevsky teaches objects (such as icons, text, graphic images) and links can be added to the web page when there is space to display both the primary and additional content (Col. 9 lines 39-41). Kanevsky's method does not explicitly limit the additional content being related to the primary content.

39. Applicants argue - *"Kanevsky teaches that the web page adaptation scheme is only partly incorporated on a client's computer, such as in a web browser. A partially incorporated web scheme is not equivalent to a wholly incorporated web scheme. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion of communicating machine instructions from a server to a client computer, as in applicants' claimed system."*

f. Java applets are downloaded from a web server to a browser. As stated in the previous office action, Java applets can function through a reference in a requested Web page such that the applet is sent to the client system. A Java applet is written in the Java programming language and therefore contains machine instructions. As such, Kanevsky teaches communication of machine instructions from a server to a client computer.

40. Applicants argue - *"Unlike Kanevsky, where a prioritized object of a known size will be put on another web page and thus cannot be perceived on a Web page with primary content, applicants' claimed method provides for either converting a portion of the content into a moving image or subdividing a portion into subportions that may be displayed sequentially so that the user can perceive the content on a single Web page without any modification that results in the content being perceived in less than its entirety. If this result cannot be achieved, only the primary content is displayed. Unlike Kanevsky, applicants' claimed method avoids making links to other Web pages, because applicants' method only displays the portion of the content that can be fully displayed in a single web page."*

g. MacPhail was used to teach the step of subdividing a portion into subportions that may be displayed sequentially. As for making links to other pages, please see the argument made in paragraph b. under paragraph 35.

Conclusion

41. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0133848 by Hunt et al. "System and method for providing and displaying information content" July 8, 2004. Discloses adaptation of web content to reduce or eliminate horizontal scrolling.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lazaro whose telephone number is 703-305-4868. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 703-308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2155

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



David Lazaro
August 17, 2004


HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISOR
PATENT EXAMINER